

REMARKS

In the **final** Office Action mailed December 21, 2009 the Office noted that claims 1-15 were pending and rejected claims 1-15. In this amendment claims 1, 12, 14 and 15 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-15 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER

Please kindly amend the attorney docket no. to **0730-1012**.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 14 and 15 stands objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that the claim is has a spelling error. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the objections.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman, U.S. Patent No. 6,988,241 in view of Devine, U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with

an argument and amendment.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action it is asserted that Guttman Col. 6, lines 22-44 discloses "defining a document standard determining a general framework of the document comprised of: a series of titles," as in previously presented claim 1.

In particular, Guttman Col. 6, lines 22-44 stated that a spreadsheet contains cells defined by intersections of rows and columns and, in lines 37-40 that *"a cell can contain labels, numbers, test (strings), dates/times or formulas [...] A string is a text entry such as "Sales Target"."*

However, that paragraph of Guttman means that a user can enter a title inside a cell and not that the document standard specifies that a predetermined cell must include a title. Moreover, the phrase *"a cell can contain labels, numbers, test (strings), dates/times or formulas"* means that the user has a choice between a number of types of contents for each cell.

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite *"defining a document standard determining a general framework of the document comprised of: a series of **fields of information for** titles and **fields of information for** notifications."* Support for the amendment may be found, for example; values authorized *in **fields*** of information, the step of defining being performed by said first user and second user, said first user *providing said* information, *each* second user receiving at least a portion of

said information; the step of defining also defining at least one selection attribute **associated with at least one field of information for enabling each second user to select** information items from said document; inputting, by said first user, said information, the step of inputting being comprised of inputting text and/or titles to the general framework and selecting values authorized on said fields, the input information items being associated with at least one selection attribute based on the document standard; **transmitting said document standard from said first user to storage for each second user**, in ¶¶ 0062; 0072; and 0114-0120 of the printed publication version of the Specification.

Thus, according to the claims, the document standard defines fields of information dedicated to titles, fields of information dedicated to notifications and selection attribute for selecting information items as in amended claim 1.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, it is further asserted that Guttman discloses "defining a document standard determining values authorized by field of information" and argues that "the information for each cell may include value, formula, formatting, editability and borders."

However, that does not means that the document standard defines values allowed to be entered in the fields of information as in amended claim 1. To the contrary, it means that any type of information may be entered in each editable cell.

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Guttman discloses "the step of defining also defining at least one selection attribute for selecting information items from said document" and argues that the designer can change/define information for any specific cell in the spreadsheet where the designer enters and edits cell values and formulas.

However, no attribute is disclosed by Guttman. The designer being able to select information that he/she enters into the cell does not imply defining selection attribute associated with information items. To the contrary, because the designer is free to select cell content, there is no need of selection attribute for selecting information as in amended claim 1.

Moreover, as claimed in the present patent application, selection attributes are used on the second user side ("selecting, by each secondary user, a sorting criterion applicable to at least one selection attribute defined by the document standard").

Further on page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Guttman discloses "the step of inputting being comprises of [...] selecting values authorized in said fields."

However, as stated above, the cited text of Guttman does not means that the document standard defines values allowed to be entered in the fields of information. To the contrary, it means that any type of information may be entered in each editable cell.

Further on page 5, it is asserted that Guttman discloses "the input information items being associated with at least one selection attribute based on the document standard."

However, as discussed above, no attribute is disclosed by Guttman.

The Office does not assert and the Applicants have not found that Devine or Devine combined with Guttman discloses such features.

Claim 12 has been amended in a manner consistent with claim 1. Various dependent claims have likewise been amended for consistency. For at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman and Devine, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 12 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman in view of Devine in view of McKaskey, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152245.

McKaskey adds nothing to the combination of Guttman and Devine as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman, Devine and McKaskey, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 2.

Claims 6, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman in view of Devine in further view of Brittan, U.S. Patent No. 6,199,078. The Applicants

respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Brittan adds nothing to the combination of Guttman and Devine as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman, Devine and Brittan, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 6, 10 and 13.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman in view of Devine in view of Kennedy, U.S. Patent Publication No. 20023/0187932.

Kennedy adds nothing to the combination of Guttman and Devine as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman, Devine and Kennedy, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 9.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman in view of Devine in view of Abelow, U.S. Patent No. 5,251,294.

Abelow adds nothing to the combination of Guttman and Devine as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman, Devine and Abelow, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 15.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-15 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb